



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICANIZATION: ITS MEANING AND FUNCTION

CAROL ARONOVICI
San Francisco, California

Out of the evils of ancient ethnic nationalism has grown a new consciousness. Out of the consciousness of kind born of blood bonds between races has come a consciousness of kind based upon well-defined community of interests. The new democracy is taking root in the foundation of modern society and is abandoning the myth of race superiority which has for so many centuries been the touchstone of race antagonism, class privilege, and economic exploitation.

Out of old hates and jealousies and self-seeking trading in the destinies of peoples, so common under the influences of imperialistic ambition, comes a new watchword, a new slogan—Democracy. Misconstrued, misunderstood, and even misguided democracy is challenging not only our sincerity, our intelligence, our aspirations, our ideals, but its own very existence. In the Near East, democracy may merely be turning the odds in favor of a new class and laying foundations for a new struggle. In America, the most stable of the democracies of the world, we may so eagerly and so rapidly integrate our national life as to render democracy a lifeless, stagnant, cumbersome machine whose existence breeds its own destruction.

The Americanization movement which has sprung into being, not from any desire to develop democracy at home, but rather as an effort for national integration that would strengthen our hands in our effort to safeguard democracy abroad is pregnant with dangers that threaten the very ideals upon which the United States built its foundation; while at the same time it opens up new vistas for the contemplation of an internationalism that would guarantee the peace of the world through the creation of a dynamic and social rather than political or racial nationalism at home.

I have sought a definition of Americanism or Americanization in tireless search through the vast although fragmentary literature produced during the present war. I have examined, not without care, the political utterances of statesmen and politicians, and have gone about among the people in search of a definition of this new slogan which would lend itself to an interpretation that is not open to challenge, and that could be made the basis of a constructive program of education or agitation free from sectionalism, alien to race or class prejudice, and, above all, free from the stifling effects of the rigidity of thought that is the enemy of all progress and fair play. Instead of beholding a vision of a new national life, a new interpretation of our social and economic order consistent with the rate of the march of the times, I am haunted by the old ghost of patriotism. Instead of that involution which places individual and nation upon their own resources and makes growth co-extensive with responsibility, I find as Herbert Spencer put it, "That while an excess of egotism is everywhere regarded as a fault, excess of patriotism is nowhere regarded as a fault." For the moment we find the United States taking upon itself the gigantic task of interpreting the limits of national life for other nations and protecting their opportunities and privileges at home as members of an international family. At the same time, however, we find Americanism looming up as a sort of "territorial sectionalism," with all its evils of isolation and ingrowing aspirations, of confusing an ideal concept of the social order as expressed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States with the concept of "a dynamic state" which is still in process of formation and integration. The whole mass of legislation of Congress and the state legislatures stands as evidence of the fact that we are still groping toward the attainment of an ideal established more than one hundred years ago and which is itself changing with the times.

Even the most hand-to-mouth existence of the social order in this country assumes at least a direction, if not an aim; but the rate of progress and the almost complete annihilation of space in international relations have made it necessary to reshape the concept of responsibility of the people, not alone to themselves and the state, but to the superstate or the international order. The time

seems not far distant when sociology or some new super-science will consider international phenomena with the same scientific care and apply the same accurate methods that we are now applying to the social order in the individual states. It is then, and then only, that "the rights of man" will come into their true significance and bear their proper relation to society. The struggle around the international peace table in Paris is witness to this new promise to the future of the human race in its relation, not alone to the rights of nations, but to the rights of labor and the rights of capital as international as well as national factors.

The present war by emphasizing and protecting the rights of nations has sounded the death-knell of nationalism. Racial or national "consciousness of kind" thrives upon pressure from without and is a conservative, static, rather than a dynamic force. With racial and national discrimination abolished or reduced, race consciousness and nationalism as social and political factors must become dynamic and progressive instead of static and conservative. But while the old basis of national classification and integration is strengthened by the renewed life granted to it by the contemplated results of the present war, a new alignment in the world-order is having its birth, and that is the classification of peoples into democracies and autocracies. This classification has taken such deep roots in the popular mind that the older nationalistic classification of the peoples of the civilized world has almost disappeared from the current discussion of the new international order. However inaccurate the basis of this new classification may seem in the face of existing conditions, and however tenaciously the old-school statesmen may resist the new current of public opinion, we are not far from the time when the people of the so-called democratic nations will demand in deed the establishment of an order under which they are living in name. Whatever may have been the meaning of Americanism at the time of the Declaration of Independence, the formulating of the Constitution of the United States, or the struggle of the Civil War, it cannot be conceived to be its meaning today. The American people have become not only the trustees of democratic tradition but they have arrogated to themselves the privilege of interpreting democracy to the world. It is for this reason

perhaps more than for any other reason, that it has become necessary so to shape the political, economic, and social machinery of this country as to make democracy attainable and its ideals most consistent with the needs of the people and most in harmony with the progress of the civilized world.

To assume that all the people living within the limits of the United States are prepared by tradition, education, or experience for the important part that they play in a new world is as presumptuous as it is untrue. The preparation of the masses for their new place in the world, is, however, nationally within our reach, but is an ethical obligation as foreign to the old ethics of nationality which resulted in the present war as was the Americanism of old western pioneer days different from the new place that Americanism has taken in international politics. The meaning of democracy is yet to be interpreted and demonstrated. The people of the United States must now make ready for the task. The obstacles in the way of this achievement are legion. To overcome these obstacles is the task of Americanization.

RACIAL AND NATIONAL ASSIMILATION

The United States Census for 1910 tells what is to some people an appalling story. Peoples from all parts of the globe with differing codes of ethics, speaking every language of the civilized world, with allegiance to governments ranging from the most democratic to the most autocratic, and bearing the outward appearance of every social group, have come here to take advantage of the social, economic, and political privileges that the United States offers.

Within recent years there has been much concern shown by anti-immigrationists regarding the dangers of mongrelizing the American people. The cry has usually come from Anglo-Saxons, who by pseudo-scientific discussion and by an appeal to the lower emotion of race superiority and the race struggle have advocated the exclusion of the so-called lower races, with the implication that only the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races are superior and therefore, desirable. The present war with the discredit heaped upon the civilization and *kultur* of the Teuton leaves the Pan-Anglo-Saxon

leaders with a clear conscience in claiming this country for the descendants of the original settlers from the British Isles, and with a large undigested mass of races either to be so absorbed and assimilated as to leave no trace of their original identity or to be kept on a low social level as a much-needed industrial group which should have and keep its place.

In a book entitled *A Vanishing Race*, the writer, Madison Grant, attempts to show that the light-haired people are slowly being eliminated from the civilized world despite the fact that they are the standard bearers of modern civilization. In proving their superiority as the advance guards of civilization, the writer appeals to history only in so far as it relates to modern times, forgetting the great civilizations of Egypt, Syria, Persia, India, Babylonia, Rome, and Spain. He is strictly a modernist because in this way alone can he come to conclusions that support his contention. I am neither an anthropologist nor a historian to attempt to analyze critically his statements. It is a well-known fact, however, that English civilization was not created by light-haired people alone, and that Great Britain has been mongrelized at least four times in the course of its integration as a great power. Anglo-Saxon, Teuton, or Latin merely designate particular species of mongrels who, by long standing, have achieved the dignity of a fixed race or people. Those familiar with the facts of history and anthropology, and who have not permitted their race instincts to blur their scientific vision, have recognized that there is not a pure race on the face of this earth, and that both Europe and Asia have built their civilizations upon the adventure of race conquest as a process of war and race assimilation as a process of peace. Drawing from the example of Spain we might almost say that where race amalgamation and race assimilation stop, advancement stops.

Jean Finot,¹ a French scholar, and Professor Frantz Boas, the well-known American anthropologist, have shown that potentially there is no race superiority or inferiority and that race purity and national progress are incompatible terms and have been so from the beginning of civilization. Gumplovitz in his *Race Struggle* has established this principle so firmly that it has never been

¹ Jean Finot, *Race Prejudice*. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1907.

successfully challenged. That the so-called races are subject to change through geographic environment, Montesquieu, Ritter, Buckle, and Ratzel have established for the scientific world, and, alas, for the scientific world almost exclusively.

With little evidence in favor of race or national discrimination on the ground of inequality, it is as amusing as it is surprising to examine the literature produced by the advocates of particular brands of race superiority, whether that be relative to the light-haired people, the special favorites of Madison Grant and Gobineau, or the dark-haired people whose cause also finds supporters. These writers seem always to find enough evidence in support of their theory upon which to hang a book.

The two main bases of discrimination against national or racial groups are physical appearance and capacity for cultural or intellectual development. In a recent study, Professor Frantz Boas¹ shows that the environment under which children of immigrants in this country live has a decided effect upon their physical development, and that the effect of these conditions extends to such parts of the body as are ordinarily taken as indexes of racial character. Alfred Odin in his monumental work *Genèse des Grands Hommes*, in which he studied the distribution of talent and genius in France, considers the relation between racial types in France and the character and rate of production of talent and genius. I can do no better than quote a portion of his statement on this subject:

If we compare this ethnographic division with the geographical distribution of French men of letters, we will seek in vain to discover the least connection between race and the fecundity in men of letters. Let any one take the map of the regions, that of the provinces, or that of the departments, and he will find everywhere that the distribution of men of letters differs entirely from that of the races. He will see that the Ligurian, Iberian, Gallic, Cimbrian, and Belgian areas prove indifferently a high, mean, or low fecundity. There is no single race in which we do not meet all grades of fecundity, while on the other hand a great many districts inhabited by different races show the same degree of fecundity. This absence of any complete correlation between the ethnologic distribution and literary "geniality" is so evident that even the most

¹ Frantz Boas, "Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants," Senate Document No. 208, 61st Congress, 2d series, 1910.

biased mind would not deny it. Nevertheless it does not necessarily disprove the action of the ethnological environment, since it may simply be due to our ignorance of the true distribution of races.¹

And later we find the following:

We here find, therefore, that the fact of belonging to a more civilized nationality and to a literature infinitely richer has exerted no favorable influence on the fecundity of the population in men of letters, but that, on the contrary, it is the inferior nationality that has been the more fruitful in this respect.²

The foregoing quotations from an impartial investigator whose findings were contrary to his own expectation would seem to indicate that at least among the less diversified ethnic types there does not seem to be any evidence of difference in intellectual creative power, provided the social conditions are favorable to such creative work.

Philip Ainsworth Means in a recent book³ in which he traces briefly the history of past civilization attempts to evaluate the various elements that could profitably be blended in the creation of democratic civilization in which all races shall have contributed a just and valuable share. His conclusions are in no way at variance with the findings of either Finot or Boas.

The absurdity of any plea for race purity, particularly among the Pan-Anglo-Saxonites, becomes especially apparent when we realize that over 80 per cent of the people in the United States are not Anglo-Saxon in origin, and that race suicide is vastly more prevalent among the peoples of Anglo-Saxon origin than among the other races in the United States.

Instead of this race provincialism which is advocated by a few writers of doubtful scientific standing but with positive views as to the superiority of their own racial origin and purity, we have a gradual but continuous race assimilation which is commensurate with the advancement of the people of recent advent in this country, and the broadening of social, political, and religious sympathies which are fostered by a democratic government.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 465-66. ² *Ibid.*, p. 468.

³ Philip Ainsworth Means, *Racial Factors in Democracy* (Marshall Jones Co., Boston, 1918), p. 468.

It is impossible to measure the rate of race amalgamation or assimilation that is going on in this country at the present time. No one can doubt, however, that this process is going on at different rates among different peoples and that a breaking down of artificial race distinctions fostered by ancient prejudices is taking place. A synthetic process of social and national integration brought about by an intensified democratic state will merge the present heterogeneous masses of racial and national groups into one great people.

It is the foreign elements that are beginning to find cause for alarm in this rapid race and national assimilation. This alarm, however, is not due to a desire to keep aloof and maintain their group integrity, but to a fear that the task of absorbing rapidly the elements of a new civilization and the exigencies of adapting one's mode of life to a new environment within a comparatively short time, will push into the background or utterly destroy those national and racial qualities that should most be preserved in the synthesis of assimilation.

With race assimilation through intermarriage, the development of new physiological characters influenced by social and economic conditions, and the process of natural selection affecting all races, it seems evident that at least in so far as the Aryan peoples are concerned, the cry for race purity is as unscientific as it is undemocratic, and that mongrelism is as much to be reckoned with as a part of the past as it is recognized as a truth relating to the future. Mongrel races are the outcome of broadened sympathies and a reaction against autocracy and aristocracy which have their roots in race superiority and right by might.

That the center of gravity of national unity has been shifting from racial similarities to *spiritual and intellectual* sympathies has at no time in the history of the world been more conclusively demonstrated than by the present war. We find, however, the beginnings of this concept of the state in its relation to the people as far back as Isocrates who at a great festival when Greece was torn by internal strife said, "*We have brought it about that the name of Greek is more appropriately given to those who partake of our Hellenic education than to those who are connected with us by the ties of blood.*"

May I add also that one of the most striking evidences of the small importance attached to race as a factor in civilization is the absence of any word which would designate race purity as a factor worthy of commendation such as we have in the word "patriotism" as indicating fidelity to the state.

The fact that only since the beginning of the war have we become truly conscious of the existence of a problem of Americanization is indicative of the fact that the war has brought before the American people for the first time the problem of a national unity. Whether national unity means unanimity of opinion, whether it means unreserved recognition of a loyalty to all aspects of the present form and practice of government, or whether it means merely the breaking away from all foreign allegiance and the participation in the affairs of the government of the United States is not always clear. The conservative Pan-Anglo-Saxon groups believe that a strong national unity can be attained only by race purity, the conservatives in the political field desire allegiance to the *statu quo* and perhaps a little myopic allegiance if possible, while the more liberal nationalism cries out for active participation in government as a sign of assimilation and Americanization. Each of these opinions has become crystallized in some form of national movement such as the Immigration Restriction League, the National Security League, and the legion of Americanization societies and loyalty leagues, commissions, and committees throughout the United States.

That there is some justification for all these efforts can hardly be doubted, but whether the remedies suggested and applied will attain the ends contemplated is not so certain. It is hardly necessary to analyze here the work and achievement of the various agencies engaged in what we have come to designate as the Americanization movement. Their aims are still ill defined, their methods still in their formative state, and their achievement hardly measurable in concrete terms. All that I shall endeavor to do in this essay is to analyze the factors which should enter into a movement which aims toward the highest individual development, the greatest harmony between the State and the state of mind of the people, the most widespread and intelligent participation of

the people in shaping the destiny of the state, and the promotion of the most rapid advancement in the welding of the masses into one people.

Let us for a moment consider what the basic factors are upon which national unity might be built. Thinkers in this field may differ as to some essentials. I shall merely presume to suggest those I consider the most important, not for the achievement of an entirely new state but for the integration and shaping the future destiny of our people and the conditions which should attend the highest development of our state.

RACIAL ASSIMILATION

Familiarity with the more recent writings on the flexibility of racial character under the influence of environment warrants the conclusion that race superiority is at least an unsettled question. There is every evidence, however, that competition for racial survival is giving way to the struggle for cultural eminence.

History has shown even within recent centuries that mongrelized peoples, such as the English, are capable of creating advanced civilization superior to the civilization of their component elements. There are no fixed races in the civilized world. There is an eternal "becoming" in the races of the civilized world and there is no race that has arrived at perfection. In the physical assimilation of one race or group of races by another race or group of races the process of sex selection with all its physical and social factors is sufficient to maintain a plane of race assimilation which will prevent race deterioration among the so-called superior racial groups.

Writers have often expressed the fear that men would select the women of the inferior race. Those familiar with the facts as they are actually taking place in our midst realize that the physical assimilation is taking place almost invariably between the best and most capable individuals and that the lower classes mix very slightly. This is especially true in peaceful assimilation where the sexes are almost equally divided and where the peaceful invaders are the passive rather than the aggressive elements. This is quite the reverse from conditions pictured by Lilienfeld who likens the

process of conquest to fertilization in biology in which the conqueror is the spermatozoön and the conquered the ovum. The former is the aggressor, the latter passive.¹ In the case of peaceful immigrant invasion the process of aggression, if any does exist, comes from the older rather than the newer elements. If a new race is to have its birth it is to be a synthetic creation subject to the laws of peaceful, natural, and social selection, acting as a free agent without haste and without aggression.

Everywhere in literature, in art, in philosophy we hear the complaint against the monotony of ideas. New racial elements are constantly required to fertilize the dormant units of development which clamor for a chance to come into being. Race differentiation is as essential as race integration, and the most highly organized civilization must slow down its rate of progress unless there is a synchronomic differentiation in national character. The simple principle of the "survival of the unlike," so well expounded by Professor Bailey,² applies with the same degree of truth to racial amalgamation and selection as it does in the life of plants. The greater the variability of type, the greater the flexibility of the social order.

As the interdependence of the people of the United States becomes intensified, as was the case during the Great War, racial valuations tend to become equalized and social valuations take on new significance. It is not doubted by serious thinkers that it is to the interest of the civilization of America to adjust its task of racial assimilation so that it may harmonize, not only with the normal rate of physical absorption of the immigrant races, but also in order to protect its institutions against a breakdown that comes from economic and social disturbances caused by the presence of abnormal masses of unabsorbed groups. What the standard of this adjustment or control should be is vastly more difficult to determine. With a large mass of ethnically, economically, socially, and politically unabsorbed foreign population still clogging the social machinery of the United States, some restrictive measures

¹ Paul V. Lilienfeld, *Zur Vertheidigung der Organization Method in der Sociologie*, p. 50. Berlin.

² L. H. Bailey, *The Survival of the Unlike*. New York: Macmillan, 1901.

are necessary. There are, to be sure, at this time certain restrictive laws which exclude undesirable types of immigrants, but the basis is only qualitative and not quantitative restriction.

Extreme restrictionists have for years advocated a closed door, but labor conditions, international obligation, and a traditional belief in the open door to the opportunities of this country have kept the tide of immigration flowing freely and in an almost torrential stream. It is obvious from the figures of the United States Census for 1910 that the foreign people who have been coming into the United States have not been absorbed with the rapidity or the thoroughness that would safeguard the social institutions of the country, nor have the conditions been such as to safeguard the immigrants themselves against such social maladjustment as vitiate their own adaptability to the new environment and at the same time places upon the country a burden of social and economic responsibility wholly out of proportion with the resources and needs of the country.¹

Some quantitative restriction is undoubtedly necessary. What the basis of this restriction should be, however, is quite difficult to determine. International relations and a sense of fairness prevent exclusion of specific nationalities which some restrictionists would call unassimilable. Judging from the mere outward appearance of the situation it seems that the more recent immigrants are less assimilable than the older groups. It must be remembered, however, that the law of diminishing returns in the assimilation and absorption of peoples is constantly at play in relation to the immigrant. It must also be remembered that the disintegration of group characters—racial and national—bears an indirect ratio to the size of the group and an indirect ratio to the contact with the new environment. The larger the group to be assimilated, the more difficult the assimilation, especially where segregation in ghettos—whether they be Jewish, Polish, French—is possible or necessary. *The problem of assimilation is, therefore, a problem of contact with the new environment and consequently a problem of distribution.*

¹ Over 5,000,000 immigrants have reached the shores of the United States between 1911 and 1917. In a double line of march the 5,516,163 illiterates in the United States would extend over a distance of 1,567 miles and marching at the rate of 25 miles a day and in columns 3 feet apart it would take 2 months for them to pass a certain point.

By distribution, however, is not meant a scattering of the foreigners into the remote and sparsely settled portions of the country, but the affording of opportunities and facilities for placing the various foreign groups where their contact with American institutions would be most readily established and where their social and economic life would be most free from the burdens of congestion and undue economic competition.

The rate of racial and social assimilation is largely dependent upon the intensity of contact with the new environment. In restricting immigration the guiding principle should be not fear of economic competition as is the case with the Chinese exclusion act, nor fear of populational congestion, which is inconceivable at least for the next hundred years, but the possibility for a quick and effective adjustment to the American order of society which would give the immigrant the best opportunity for self-development and for intelligent participation and service in the building up of an American civilization.

So far any social marking system which would determine accurately the rate of assimilation of the foreign peoples is not available. Professor Franklin Giddings and others have attempted such a marking system, but even if it could be accepted as mathematically accurate it cannot be taken as conclusive because it relates only to the elements to be assimilated and not to the conditions which make such assimilation possible. Until we can measure both elements, the conditions which promote assimilation and the results accomplished under these conditions, any accurate mathematical basis for the limitation of immigration is impossible.

The question of assimilation again is a many-sided process. Too rapid a racial assimilation is not necessary and is not a condition of social assimilation. All that remains for us to do is, therefore, the establishment of a basis of limiting immigration in numbers on the basis of their present social and political assimilation in so far as an index of approximate accuracy can be agreed upon. Citizenship, ability to speak, read, and write the English language, adjustment to economic environment, employment, etc., are perhaps the bases upon which restrictions could be based with some degree of mathematical accuracy. These factors would, if made

the bases of immigration legislation, at least, lend themselves to flexible enforcement that will keep pace with the progress that this country is likely to make in the future toward creating increasingly favorable conditions for educational, economic, and political assimilation. Such legislation should be prepared by a commission of scientists and should be subject to constant adjustment so that the progress of this country may go on unhampered by the needs for labor and without isolating America from the world-reservoirs of desirable population.

CONSERVATION OF RACIAL CHARACTERS

In our hysterical rush to assimilate and absorb all foreign elements in the United States we are in imminent danger of destroying vast treasures of racial assets which under careful nurture and direction would become invaluable assets in the development of American civilization.

Aside from the artificial inducements offered to the foreigner in order to make him accept American customs, American standards of living, American methods of employing his leisure, the law of imitation tends to denude the normal life of the immigrant of all the traditions and influences which in the home environment acted as a means of social control on the one hand and as a stimulus for self-expression on the other.

Much of the lawlessness of the immigrant is not due to criminality or immorality, but to a failure longer to recognize old traditions, and a lack of understanding of the social mechanism of the new environment.

The measure of their value as potential members of American citizenship is sometimes sought in the rapidity with which such potential citizens give up their methods of life, their habits of thought, their language, their religion, their dress, their leisure-time predilections. The foreigner who changes his whole mode of life with the ease and carelessness with which he takes off his coat is erroneously considered a good prospective American. This standard of measuring assimilation is as dangerous as it is unfair to those who preserve a certain loyalty to their traditions and customs, etc., and change them only as they become convinced that

the new is better than the old. "In Rome do as the Romans do" is not assimilation but simulation.

During the war we were too ready to accept outward appearances for actual fact and much hypocrisy flourished upon the wastes of the Espionage Act and the artificially stimulated hate that made the government a party to much unnecessary and unjust prosecution. Perhaps as much antagonism and suspicion against Americanization was aroused by the too rigid and not always reasonable enforcement of the Espionage Act and the part that the public took in it as by any other means.

What we failed to realize is that sincere disagreement with government is less dangerous than insincere agreement. To what extent the government with the co-operation of the public has succeeded in selecting and in dealing out justice to those who for one reason or another come under the law of the Espionage Act, the future alone will tell.

It seems obvious that Americanization is a growth not to be achieved by the turn of the hand. It must be gradual, it must be sincere, it must be based upon conviction. Perhaps these are trite commonplaces that are hardly worth mentioning. The practices indulged in by both governmental and private agencies during the war, however, warrant their restatement at least.

The rate of progress of society depends upon its flexibility and its flexibility is determined by its variants. Americanization if it is to become a factor of progress rather than a means of safety must look upon the foreign elements as variants with unit characters which should be subject to selection and development to the extent that they may be or may become useful in the synthetic processes upon which the progress of the social order depends. Americanization should not be looked upon, therefore, as a ritual harking back to the old, but as a creation looking forward to the new.

Each national and racial group has its own inheritance of civilization. In the field of science, art, literature, philosophy, sociology, politics, each and all display certain aptitudes which are not only worth conserving and adding to the store of our achievements

in these fields of endeavor, but, they can and should be used as a leavening element in getting new interpretations, new visions of American civilization in the future.

Literature, art, science, which is not fertilized by a constant influx of new elements free from the ritualism and homogeneity which must of necessity become increasingly a part of too intensive an adaptation, becomes either sterile or monotonous. The vision of the unassimilated is frequently necessary in the opening up of new highways of thought and progress. Among the foreign groups in America we find ample manifestation of the creative elements which if developed without too great an eagerness to mold them into the pattern of the established standard will yield new and invigorating elements in the creative work of the nation.

The Americanization movement should not only tolerate these exotic manifestations of creative thought and creative functioning, but it should consider the conservation of these creative instincts as a means of accelerating progress and of increasing the variability and creative powers of the nation. Native music, native literature, native arts and crafts, the native dance, philosophic thought, political idealism, etc., are all to be found among the foreign people. These represent potentially their contribution toward native creative genius, they are capable of new interpretations for their own perfecting, and they may interpret America from new angles and with benefit to all. They constitute an aspect of Americanization that will save this country from the decadence that has overcome Spain and the stifling rigidity of the Pan-Germanic chamber of horrors.

LANGUAGE

Language as one of the common basic factors in Americanization is essential to the life of the state as it establishes a common basis of communion between the people. It is the common denominator of the nation.

In order to reach this common basis of understanding the conditions brought about by the war have called into being a spirit of contempt against non-English-speaking people and an effort to force upon the foreigner the English language. Laws have been introduced into the various state legislatures and regulations are

being urged upon all authorities to abolish the use of all foreign languages.

While I am in hearty accord with all legitimate and sympathetic effort to teach English and to establish the English language as the sole official language of the country, I am not sure that the methods employed or suggested will attain this end. The efforts of the Pan-Slavic leaders to destroy the national existence of conquered races by prohibiting the use of the native language, the methods employed by the Germans and Austrians in their endeavor to Prussianize or Germanize some of the people within their borders are not consistent with American ideals as I conceive them to be, and have so far proved themselves less effective than the policy of tolerance so far practiced in this country. There is no country in the world where more foreign tongues are spoken than in the United States, and yet no country has so quickly and so easily made its official language the common language of the people as the United States. Such a foolish law as was passed by North Dakota where not more than three people when gathered together are permitted to speak the German language, or the executive order of the governor of Ohio which prohibited the use of foreign languages at public gatherings, are not going to destroy the desire to speak that language in so far as its use in this country is concerned. The opening of adequate schools for the teaching of English, the proper subsidy of all institutions of learning which undertake the teaching of English to both adults and children, and similar friendly efforts are the only effective means of achieving this end.

I am not fearful that we shall perish for lack of a common language, but I do fear that we shall fall the prey of overzealous patriots who confuse their desire for revenge with love for their country. The army we sent to fight for democracy was not an English-speaking army. It was a truly American army made up of every race and nationality that has reached these shores since Columbus first discovered America, speaking every language of the civilized world and having given up, in most instances, allegiance to all great countries of the world in order to join American forces in their struggle for the safety of democracy throughout the world.

Love of country requires no special language but it does require a spirit of loyalty and service and devotion beyond the bounds of any known tongue.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Statistical statements derived from the rather antiquated figures of the United States Census for 1910 have been used by alarmists to demonstrate the pressing need for an active campaign to teach the foreigners the English language. The argument is that the foreign groups are reluctant to abandon their native tongue and speak the language of their adopted country.

Perhaps the most serious difficulty in the way of teaching the English language is the illiteracy of many of the immigrants of this country. This same difficulty is also a momentous factor in facilitating social and political participation in the affairs of the state. Examination of the figures of the census shows that while 4.07 per cent of the natives of native parents are illiterate, only 1.32 per cent of the natives of foreign and mixed parentage are illiterate, while the illiteracy of the foreign-born is only 11.86 per cent of the foreign-born population over 21 years of age. The fact that the illiteracy of the native of foreign parents is less than one-third of the illiteracy of the natives 21 years of age and over is rather significant as indicating the zeal of the foreigners to afford their children educational opportunities.

The Census of 1910 also tells us that 2,896,606 foreign born whites 15 years of age and over were unable to speak the English language. While these figures represent a very unusual proportion of foreign persons unable to speak the language of the country in which they are living, when we remember that during the four years preceding the 1910 Census of the United States, nearly four million (3,861,575) persons entered this country and that it takes some time to acquire a knowledge of the English language the figures are not nearly as significant as they seem at first. It should also be remembered that the foreign groups which have acquired a knowledge of the language have done so despite, rather than because of, the provisions made for their education by the local, state, or federal governments.

The 1910 Census also tells a rather striking story when we consider school attendance of persons between 6 and 14 years of age. While 83.5 per cent of the native children of native parents attended school, foreign-born children attended school to the extent of 82.3 per cent, but when we consider the native children of foreign and mixed parentage we find that 88 per cent of them attended school. As most of the immigrants live in the North Atlantic states it will be argued that these foregoing figures do not represent conditions with due relation to educational opportunities. We find, however, that in the North Atlantic division the difference in the proportion of children under 14 years of age attending school according to parentage is so slight as to be negligible.¹

The evidence seems to lead to the conclusion that in so far as illiteracy or the learning of the English language is concerned there has been no serious difficulty created by the immigrants themselves. The main difficulties, however, are to be found in the lack of facilities for learning English, the low grade of teachers provided, the hours and conditions under which teaching must be done, the failure to employ teachers with experience in handling foreign adults, and above all the fact that most adult foreigners during their first years in the United States must earn their living in ill-paid and exhausting occupations which leave them physically unfit for any mental effort.

With about three million persons still to be trained in the use of the English language, the federal, state, and local governments should develop well-trained teachers and proper conditions of teaching during hours when mental effort is least difficult. Perhaps there is no nation in the world that is so non-linguistic as are the natives of this country and they should have a sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of learning a new language, particularly by people with a limited education or altogether without education.

While language is the common denominator of all social and political education among the people already assimilated, it must be recognized that the most important period of political and social education in the life of the immigrant is during the first twelve months or two years in this country. It is then that the impressions

¹ Abstract of 1910 United States Census, Table XIV.

are strongest and count the most in the future adjustment to the new environment. It is obvious, therefore, that a prohibition of the use of a foreign language in public meetings, and particularly the abolition of the foreign press in this country, would be nothing short of a calamity. They are the channels through which the foreigner can keep in touch with conditions, and all leadership of the foreigners is impossible unless it is expressed in the native tongue. To assume that any foreigner can acquire a knowledge of English so as to listen to or read intelligently during a period of less than two years is to expect a great deal more than many intelligent American travelers have been able to achieve in their sojourns in foreign lands.

It is safe to say that during normal times the reading of the foreign press in the United States reveals a greater respect for American institutions, keener and fairer analysis of political and social conditions, less sweeping condemnation of public men, less unenlightened partisanship, and a better sense of proportion in relation to the abnormalities and irregularities of society than we find in much of the American press using the English language as its medium of expression. One can find more basis for dissatisfaction, mistrust, and even disgust, with American life and institutions by reading unintelligently and trustfully the statements that fill the pages of our daily newspapers than could be invented by the most imaginative, the most pernicious, and the most radical foreign agitator. From personal experience, I can state that much of the daily press published in the English language gives an unfair, a distorted conception of America, and it should be kept out of the hands of the newly arrived immigrant with the same concern as we would keep pornographic literature out of the hands of innocent childhood.

While the teaching of English and its use among the foreigners should not be forced by ill-conceived legislation, nor indeed by social ostracism or artificially stimulated public opinion, the education of the children of foreign-born parentage should be carried on primarily in the language of the country and with every reasonable effort to make this language the common language of all. In doing this, however, we must not lose sight of the danger that any effort

to interfere with the learning or use of the language of the parents presents. The disintegration of Austria, the new alignment of national units all over Europe, shows that the peaceful teaching of a language is not synonymous with the forcible abolition of the mother-tongue.

CONSERVATION AND CROSS-FERTILIZATION OF CULTURES

Teutonic egotism and imperialism conspired during the last quarter-century against the cultures of peoples whom they sought to absorb or assimilate. Like a ravaging reptile they covered their prey with the slime of contempt in order the easier to swallow them.

In this country while we are not boasting of a special kind of *kultur* and are not aspiring to a *weltmacht* patterned on the Teutonic monster, we have nevertheless endeavored to idealize American institutions and American government as the creation of a people with all claims to national integration, national independence, and a common national ideal. We are likely to overlook the fact that our language and most of our political and social institutions are the inheritance of the old world, mainly Anglo-Saxon, adjusted to a new geographic environment. Having established the new state we cannot afford to become isolated or avoid the influences of interplay of civilization and culture of other nations. A hermit individualism in a nation is as destructive of civilization as is the predatory individualism of the Teutonic type.

A glance at the broadest outline of the history of culture shows clearly that no culture has impressed itself upon the world without the widest possible cross-fertilization. Egypt, Babylon, Athens, Rome, France, England, are all the hybrids of interplay and cross-fertilization of great cultures without which decadence and reaction would have been the world's inheritance.

The vast influx of peoples from all of the civilized world affords a new, broader, and less wasteful opportunity for cultural interplay than we can find in the chronicles of the history of civilization. The Americanization movement, however, seems to have become a nationalistic movement patterned upon the traditions of Anglo-Saxon and Puritan culture. But even in the countries in which these cultures originated they have undergone in the span of the history

of this country radical changes due largely to the influences of European civilization rather than to the internal development of an older civilization and culture. The peoples which have come to these shores represent French, German, Italian—various cultures. To be sure many of the individuals are not representative of the classes which in the past have been the leaders in the development of these native cultures. It must be admitted, however, that when we analyze the conditions, economic, social, political, and religious, under which the masses have lived for generations past, and compare them with better and more democratic distribution of opportunities as well as the greater freedom of self-development afforded in the United States we shall admit that new powers of self-development will be released and that those subconscious residues of folk *mores* and folk art will again become the forces which give full sway to the creative impulse. To crush all tradition, to scoff at the *mores* of a people, to discount the creative values of the heritage of a civilization, to fail to capitalize the opportunity for cross-fertilization of cultures is to destroy the dynamic forces which make for progressive, regenerative, vital, human culture.

In so far as the approach to Americanization of the foreign people of the United States is concerned, we should, therefore, not assume that the attainment of a dead level will be either desirable for the aliens or beneficial to the perpetuation or perfection of the culture of the United States. Inbreeding in cultural development is as dangerous as in the biological life of a people.

President Wilson has said: "Only a peace between equals can last; only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit." In Americanization a peaceful merging and co-operative development of a nation can be obtained when out of depths of each people comes a desire for participation and common benefit that is born out of equality, that is devoid of fear, that looks to the future and not to the past, that considers tradition a stepping-stone and not a chain, and that looks upon the culture of the world as an achievement to be conserved and developed rather than as a menace.

We need the music of Italy, the clear thinking of France, the industry and thoroughness of Germany, the truthfulness and art

of Russia. We have them all in our midst if we would only learn to find them, encourage them, and use them.

The Americanization study at present being carried on by the Carnegie Foundation under the able leadership of Dr. Allen T. Burns, may give us some notion of the ways in which the various foreign cultures manifest themselves in our midst and to what extent an intelligent Americanization movement would assist in making these cultures a part of our common heritage out of which will be realized a new world.

DISTRIBUTION OF IMMIGRANTS

The din of the reiterated panacea that the distribution of immigrants would solve the Americanization problem is in everyone's ears. Take the foreigner out of the congested cities, place him in small communities or on the farm, isolate him from his fellow-countrymen, surround him by Americans and compel him to speak nothing but English and you have solved the whole problem. This method sounds so simple and practical that it is bound to be impractical and inconsistent with the experience of society.

It is clear to anyone familiar with immigrant life that congestion, poor sanitation, low standards of living, are not the reasons why the immigrants prefer the cities with all their attending evils. These conditions are merely the commodities as they find them when they reach these shores, and their control depends not upon the new arrival who has no voice in government and whose economic position is too precarious to afford a choice, but upon the already assimilated people participating in the conduct and control of our social and political institutions. The Irish and the German immigrants were the forerunners of the Italian and the Polish, and their transition into Americanism took place through slums that were even worse than what we now find on the lower east side of New York, or in the stockyard district of Chicago.

When we analyze the causes of congestion among the immigrants we find that they are fundamentally economic. A large proportion of our immigrants are unskilled workers or tradesmen with skill and training which require new adjustments to industries in which the division of tasks, the trade processes, and the conditions

of labor are essentially different from those found in the same industries in the old country.

Unskilled trades and the semi-skilled trades employ large numbers of workers and these are largely open to the immigrant. Without a knowledge of the language and ignorant of American methods of work and employment he must depend upon the people of his own race or nationality for guidance and assistance. In learning a new trade he must be able to understand instructions and in looking for a job he must be able to speak and read the language of his employer or his agent.

If he desires to go out on the farm the only choice he has is day labor, a very precarious occupation with all the attending evils of seasonal employment, ignorance of the newer methods of cultivation and complete isolation from those who in time of need can understand and help meet difficulties. To become a farm owner requires capital and a knowledge of American methods of cultivation, marketing, and business.

For these reasons the immigrant remains in his colony. He also has certain social needs which he cannot get in an American environment. The church, the lodge, the social center, cannot exist except when there are present in the community or neighborhood large enough groups of the same nationality or race to justify their presence and guarantee their maintenance. All these institutions if conducted in English are of no value to the immigrant for at least the first two or three years of his stay in the United States. Even evening schools for foreigners for the purpose of teaching them the English language cannot be maintained with any degree of efficiency without having a certain amount of segregation. The very work of Americanization cannot function unless it can deal with groups instead of individuals. To endeavor Americanization by scattering individual immigrants in American communities is to attempt Americanization by a process of gradual social and economic suffocation.

To depend upon the individual immigrant to work out his own problems of Americanization or leave the responsibility to the American neighbor as an individual, disinterested and unorganized, is nothing short of subjecting the immigrant to a lonely existence,

mentally and economically a Robinson Crusoe in an atmosphere of social ostracism.

Passing for a moment from the problem of creating the most favorable conditions for rapid assimilation to the question of making it possible for every national or racial group to contribute some share of its cultural attainments toward the life of the American people we find segregation essential. It is strange that we are always willing to purchase talent and genius when offered in the foreign market and hardly consider the price. The same talent and genius, the same creative forces are in operation, or could be made to operate, among the forty or fifty groups of immigrants if these groups are afforded the opportunity for development and self-expression of which they are capable. The record of immigrant art is already commanding respect in the cultured circles of the United States. Under conditions of poverty, congestion, social ostracism, ignorance of American taste, much has already been produced. The salvaging of this creative force, much of which becomes stifled under the conditions confronting the immigrant, should be part of a constructive program of Americanization. A beginning has already been made by the social settlements, the social centers, etc. A wider and more far-reaching field is now open, but the artist must not too abruptly be torn from the influences of his native people whom he can serve as he serves the nation as a whole.

I have often been told that the immigrant is responsible for inefficiency and corruption in government. This argument is hardly worth discussing. Government is in the hands of permanently assimilated voters, many of whom are natives and of Anglo-Saxon origin. Examination of the standards of honesty and efficiency of municipal and state governments will show that there is no relation between the proportion of assimilated foreigners and the type of local or state government. Should we venture upon so sacrilegious an inquiry as to the comparative ability of the members of the United States Congress and the nativity of the voters who elected them, I am of the opinion that the evidence would not be against the sense of discrimination of the naturalized voter.

On the whole, it may not be considered a heresy to say that the segregation of foreign groups is a desirable condition of their gradual Americanization and development as a people. Congestion with its attending evils is subject to control and the effectiveness of the control depends upon the American people and not upon the immigrant. Distribution of the immigrant is a problem of economic well-being and not one of national and political assimilation.

ENVIRONMENT AS A SOCIALIZING FACTOR IN AMERICANIZATION

To many interested in Americanization, the social and political assimilation of the immigrant appears as a process of education. Teach the foreigner the English language, educate him about American standards, inform him about American political institutions, impress him with the opportunities afforded to him by the United States, preach to him about the moral codes of the American people, make him feel his responsibility toward America; these are the ways and means by which we expect to achieve the task that is before us.

While no one would venture to discount the value of the educational processes outlined above, they imply a thoroughly developed educational system, leisure time during which this educational program can be carried out, and a mental and physical receptivity in the immigrant attained through a favorable economic and social environment.

To assume that education without adequate control of environment will accomplish the assimilation of the immigrant groups is to fail to realize the value of direct, personal contact as against bookish and oratorical forcible feeding.

With housing conditions unsuited for the attainment of the American ideal of home life; with low wages, irregularity of employment, bad working conditions, absence of or inadequate insurance against sickness, death, accident, and unemployment; with an enforced sectionalism prompted by national and racial discrimination and the constant and entirely too obvious effort to Americanize consciously or unconsciously, prompted by a sense of fear or a sense of superiority on the part of the native elements,

we cannot expect a sudden change of mind in the immigrant without reservation and with full confidence in the honesty of purpose of those most active in Americanization work.

The social agencies which have fought against child labor, which have made every effort to improve living conditions, the organizations interested in the promotion of social insurance, and all the other societies, organizations, and agencies working toward the improvement of living conditions in this country, have done more in the past and will continue in the future to do more toward the Americanization of the immigrant than all of the Americanization leagues, societies, committees, commissions, boards, etc., could do under the most favorable circumstances. Americanization without social amelioration is futile; assimilation without friendly social service is inconceivable.

THE IMMIGRANT AS A SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNIT

Man is a social and political being. As we look over the history of oppressed peoples we find that the measure of their oppression may be found in the manner and extent of their participation in the social and political life of the nation. In the United States we do not find such a deliberate effort to restrain the immigrant from participation in the social and political life of the nation or the community. It must be admitted, however, that the playground, the settlement, the charitable agency, the civic organization, are constantly superimposing upon the individual and group life of the immigrant certain conditions of living, certain social and moral standards, certain moral restraints with which they are not familiar, and in the shaping of which they have had no part. It may be argued that the alien population is not sufficiently advanced either to conceive or to impose upon themselves what we loosely call American standards. This is an assumption that has never been proved and if measured in terms of the ability to develop such standards by a general organization of Americans for the same purposes we are likely to find that they are indifferent to or wholly ignorant of the needs and purposes of most important and necessary reforms. As a short cut to success most reformers assume that they know more about the things the people need or

want than the people know themselves. While this may be partially true we have never justified this assumption by organizing the people as a whole for the reforms which we impose upon them and the social order under which they live. In other words we are living in an age of extensive reform with the least possible democratic participation in the shaping and achievement of these reforms.

In the case of the foreign groups no effort is ever made to acquaint them with the purposes of actual or contemplated reforms. It is not for them to choose but to submit.

Buckle said that the chief obstacle to progress is in "the protective spirit," which leads one class of men to hamper the liberty of a nation. I fear that our Americanization movement and even our general reform movements are retarded by our failure to take the people into our confidence and make them participants rather than laboratory specimens of our social experiments. Whether it is in the organization of relief or in the development of a community center, whether it is in forcing sanitary improvements or the collection of funds for the Red Cross, the foreign groups can and should be organized and guided into an intelligent participation in all our social and political activities and reforms.

To assume that citizenship when officially granted automatically endows the new voter with the powers of discrimination, with an intelligent understanding of our complex social institutions, and with adequate experience as a participant in public affairs is as absurd as it is dangerous. In the field of health, recreation, industrial organization, moral protection, the foreigner can and should be made to function during the years of preparation for citizenship and this can be achieved without in any way interfering with his personal liberties. Participation is the most effective school of citizenship.

CITIZENSHIP

It has been pointed out that Americanization is a process not a doctrine, a growth not a science, and that experience and participation are its dynamic forces.

The foundation of the Americanization movement must, therefore, rest not upon a doctrine of a political or social order peculiar

to a particular class but upon the development of an intelligent and practical contact with American institutions and particularly with the American people. You cannot hire Americanization work done. It is the task of all the American people to inspire confidence and to offer helpful assistance that is above suspicion of creed or class.

The social worker's place in Americanization is uncontested, but this task is more directly concerned with the Americanization of the American people than with the assimilation of the foreigner. It is the social worker's privilege to know and understand the alien mind, to meet the problems and difficulties of the foreigner when at the bottom of the social ladder, to endeavor to procure justice where our institutions have done injustice, to mend broken hearts and assist in the recovery of lost hopes and ideals. The social worker has command over the most telling facts regarding the failures of American institutions. It is his duty to Americanize the Americans by making these facts known and their causes understood.

It is an interesting paradox that most of the activities of Americanization workers are centered upon the increase in the voting forces of the immigrant groups and that this movement is very largely sponsored by the conservative interests of the country. If the survival of American institutions is at stake, if imminent danger is to be found in the large masses of foreign-born people in this country, would not these dangers to American institutions be increased with the rapid and artificially stimulated increase in voting population among the groups of immigrant origin?

Anyone familiar with the adequacy and method of ascertaining an alien's fitness for citizenship will realize that they can hardly meet the needs of efficient scrutiny and determination upon the various qualifications essential in the performance of the taxing duties of American citizenship.

The law which determines fitness for citizenship is in itself so defective and out of harmony with requirements for citizenship that it needs fundamental changes and adjustments. Expediency rather than efficiency is its aim in so far as the administration of the law is concerned. The interest, convenience, and effective functioning of the new citizen are disregarded.

It would seem that six fundamentals should be made upon the basis of naturalization, namely: (1) Thorough understanding of the functions of American government. (2) Recognition of the personal element in determining upon the period of residence required for citizenship. (3) Recognition of citizenship as a possible reward for service rendered rather than as a gift to be applied for. (4) The transfer of naturalization procedure from judicial to administrative offices. (5) The recognition of a woman's privilege to maintain or acquire citizenship independently of her husband. (6) The abolition of voting restriction upon women.

Perhaps it would be proper to expand somewhat each of the above fundamentals, obvious though they may seem.

1. *Understanding of function of government.*—Anyone who has witnessed the examination of applicants for citizenship has realized the inadequacy of the present system. It is not impressive, it cannot be thorough, and it cannot be taken as a guaranty that the new voter is either capable or is in position to become capable of passing upon public issues and casting an intelligent vote immediately upon his or her enfranchisement. The limited knowledge of English required, the general questions as to the Constitution of the United States, the name of the president, etc., are hardly sufficient to warrant confidence in the system or in the value of citizenship as a guaranty of loyalty and intelligent participation. It would seem that some classification of citizenship might be found effective and practical.

The present method of requiring first and second papers in a way implies classification, as every person who has taken out first papers is entitled to some protection by the United States government. There should be a difference, however, between citizenship in the sense of protection and service and the right to franchise. As every person taking out first papers declares severance of allegiance to the country of birth it should be recognized upon proper examination as a virtual citizenship without the right to vote.

Within two or three years any person desiring to acquire the franchise should present before some state or local government agency evidence of sufficient knowledge of the English language and understanding of the mechanism of the American government,

federal, state, and local, before application for the right to full voting citizenship is granted. This would avoid clogging courts and other offices and would furnish a better guaranty of ability to exercise the vote than is possible under the present system. If we distinguish between citizenship and franchise with regard to the millions of intelligent native-born women in the United States, would it not be practical to make the same distinction in the case of the foreign peoples who have no familiarity with American institutions and American government?

Certain limits of time could be fixed to govern the securing of the right to franchise, and the acquisition of this right could be made so attractive that every effort would be made to secure this privilege. While this may retard the increase in the number of voters it would be greatly to the advantage of the immigrant to have to become familiar with the responsibilities to be assumed, and it surely would not endanger any of the present American institutions, which we are endeavoring to save, by an increase in the volume of citizens unfamiliar with the government which they must in part determine and control.

2. *The personal element.*—Five years is the minimum time required to secure citizenship and the franchise. This period is entirely too long for some people and too short for others. An educated immigrant capable of speaking the English language is surely capable of acquiring at least the elementary principles of American institutions and government. The standards of living that prevail in this country are surely more rapidly acquired by the educated, English-speaking immigrant, than by those who are alien to all education and are ignorant of the language of the country.

It would seem reasonable, therefore, to assume that a two- or three-year period, as we find it in the countries of Western Europe, would be sufficient as a minimum residence prerequisite for citizenship and the franchise.

3. *Citizenship as a reward.*—The people of this country look upon citizenship as a privilege but fail to recognize its value as a reward. There are scores of foreign-born leaders in this country who through peculiar ability and by intense devotion to the cause

of their people and to American institutions have performed invaluable public service to the country. The time limit imposed upon the acquisition of citizenship prevents such persons from becoming a part of the people of the United States within a period of five years. While discrimination in favor of such leaders would seem undemocratic, everyone realizes that reward for service rendered is essentially just. Such citizenship might be granted by Congress or by presidential decree and lift the process out of the commonplace mechanism of its present administration.

4. *Administration of naturalization laws.*—At the present time we are witnessing a very peculiar division of labor in the administration of the naturalization laws. The Department of Labor, through the Bureau of Naturalization, deals with the investigation of qualifications of applicants. Upon the evidence of the agents of this Bureau largely depends the decision of the Department of Justice as to the granting of the privileges of citizenship, while the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Education is dealing with the problem of securing means for educating the immigrants in matters of American life, language, and government.

Those who have kept in touch with the recent activities of the various federal departments realize that the popularity of Americanization work has driven the chiefs of various bureaus and even heads of departments into a sort of competitive struggle which is likely to result in a type of governmental sabotage which will retard rather than promote effective Americanization work.

One hesitates to suggest which department of the federal government should be in full and exclusive charge of the work, but a unification of functions is necessary and the department most vitally concerned with the problem and best equipped to carry out a consistent, constructive policy should be intrusted with the responsibility of promoting the education and granting the privilege of citizenship. The training of citizens is no more the task of the Department of Justice than is health work the function of the Department of the Treasury.

Whatever department is intrusted with this important work, it should have full responsibility and adequate funds and a personnel capable of achieving the best results.

4. *Independent citizenship for women.*—One of the most serious defects of the present naturalization laws is the fact that women are entitled to citizenship on the basis of the citizenship of their husbands. This makes for injustice to native women who marry persons of foreign birth and who thereby lose their own citizenship in the country of their birth and, as is frequently the case, in the country of birth of their remote ancestors. It is also clear that in the states where women vote, the volume of women voters of foreign birth is dependent upon the qualifications of their husbands, and not upon their own qualifications. This inconsistency borders on stupidity. Should woman suffrage become effective throughout the United States, hundreds of thousands of women who have never proved their qualifications for citizenship would become voters much to the confusion of the whole body politic. Modification of the laws of naturalization separating the citizenship of husband and wife would obviate whatever danger we may be inclined to find in woman suffrage from the point of view of adding to the voting population a group of women unqualified for the franchise.

5. *Woman suffrage.*—While we are straining to secure a universal desire for active citizenship on the part of immigrants from every land, it would seem part of the Americanization movement to enfranchise half the potential voting population of the states in which woman suffrage does not exist. With the doubling of the voting population by the enfranchisement of the native women and the separation of the citizenship of the husband from the citizenship of the wife, a much fairer, safer, and more intelligent citizen body could be created and maintained.

It is clear that whatever the value of expediting the acquisition of citizenship, the naturalization laws of this country are in need of radical revision in order to achieve the ends that they are designed to achieve.

THE NEW NATIONALISM

A polyglot army with differing traditions, born in every corner of the accessible areas of the globe, with religious beliefs representing every creed and denomination known to the civilized world, fought for democracy in the trenches of Europe. They

were Yanks in spirit and in aspiration, those millions who went overseas prepared for the supreme sacrifice, but in their veins flowed the blood of all nations and in their hearts were hidden treasures of tradition and culture that have not been and will not be discovered and developed until the Americanization movement realizes that a new nationalism must be created out of the old. President Wilson has shifted the meaning of patriotism from national honor to national justice and has established the measure of nationalism within the bonds of self-determination. These new interpretations of national life, instead of tending toward a greater intensity of the old-time patriotism is paving the way toward internationalism of which the League of Nations is only a negative beginning. As we look upon the League of Nations outlined by President Wilson and the Conference in Paris we realize that its establishment is merely an incident in the new nationalism—a nationalism which will establish a national honor and a national code of morals to be judged not alone by the religious and national traditions of nations, but by a new code of international ethics, which will achieve for each nation what our courts and public opinion have achieved in fostering a free development of the individual in harmony with the state and the best interests of the nation.

By removing the resistance to the development of national life the golden gates of internationalism have been opened. In the Americanization movement the prohibition of language, taboo of customs, and disregard of tradition should be removed in order to do away with the conscious or unconscious resistances which these ill-conceived methods have produced. The war which has just come to a close will emancipate Europe from the delirium of nationalism which has for its basis the measure of national strength by the degree of national danger. Nationalism so far has been a state of mind corresponding to a geographic fact of international importance. The new nationalism in America and throughout the world will be found eventually in the sphere of social consciousness which works toward the perfection of a political state which will be measured in terms of its harmony with individual values. Based upon a political philosophy inspired by the highest idealism,

with a people in whose minds and veins may be traced the traditions of all the civilized peoples of the world, one must look upon the new nationalism as a new hope, a new ambition, and say with Black:

I shall not cease from mental strife
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.

Of course, the sword is too antiquated to use in the building of a people, and the vast areas of the United States open a new world for the building of a Jerusalem in which love and loyalty and freedom shall blend to create a new people, in which the spirit rather than the sword shall lead, and in which civilization shall blend and grow by a "contagion of co-operation."

Americanization is not to be interpreted as the new nationalism unless it means the creation of a condition in which the full attainment of the ideals of America by all its people and the achievement of this ideal for all its people is understood thereby. The new nationalism will arise out of an honest effort to conform American life to American ideals and not from the satisfaction that what is America is American and should, therefore, be accepted or imposed upon all those who have come to these shores to find Americanism and have merely landed in America.

AMERICANIZATION SERVICE

A new conscience has been evolved during the war relative to the assimilation of the foreigner. It is almost the fashion now to talk, write, or organize in the interest of Americanization work. Every existing organization has an Americanization committee, every city and every state is feverishly organizing for the organization of Americanization service, and folks who used to be just human beings are being classified into American and un-American, according to their willingness to agree or disagree with the Americanizers as to what their social, economic, and political ideals should be.

They call us aliens, we are told,
Because our wayward visions stray
From that dim banner they unfold,
The dreams of worn-out yesterday.

It is much easier to assimilate and Americanize by pointing to the future than by trying to improve the past.

As far as one can discover, the new consciousness relating to the need for Americanization is justified only on the ground that the efforts of the past have failed to afford ample, intelligent, and sympathetic means of protecting the interests of the foreigners, giving them a true concept of what America is and can be, and what the relation of the immigrant to his country of adoption should be. The social settlement, the community center, the newly developed community council, the schools for adult foreigners, the immigrant protective leagues, the charitable agencies, the legal-aid societies, are all engaged in the task of translating American law and American institutions into service. By strengthening the agencies already at work, by furnishing adequate financial support to organizations struggling with inefficiency because of lack of funds, by improving the technique of the service, by recognizing the fundamental human values in the immigrant, and removing all discrimination in discussion and treatment of foreigners, we shall speed up a task which the workers in the fields mentioned understand best and are most adequately equipped to handle.

Understanding, tolerance, service, are the chief needs of the immigrant in process of Americanization. Beyond these efforts the Americanization movement applies to all the people of America and comprises all education, all effort toward social justice, all striving toward national unity and national development. Americanization as conceived by the conservative alarmist as a cure against independent thinking and against mass demands for industrial and social justice is an anachronism that will perish by its own violence.